

- 5 -

Remarks

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on December 16, 2003. Claims 1-10 are presented below for examination. The Examiner has objected to the disclosure, and claim 8, and has rejected claim 4 due to informalities. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joachims et al. (WebWatcher: A Tour Guide for the World Wide Web, Proceedings of the 1997 IJCAI, August 1997), hereinafter Joachims, in view of Lieberman, (agents, ACM Conference on Human Factors and Computing Systems, March 27, 1997), hereinafter Lieberman.

Applicant has carefully studied the references provided by the Examiner, and the Examiner's objections, rejections and statements of the instant Office Action. Responding to the Examiner's objections and rejections due to informalities, applicant herein provides appropriate amendment to the specification and claims to overcome the objections and rejections.

In response to the Examiner's merit rejections of applicant's claims, applicant herein judicially amends the language of the base claims only to more distinctly claim the data that is gathered and summarized from the Web pages accessed by the navigation and data-gathering utility. Applicant further provides argument to more particularly point out to the Examiner the subject matter of applicant's invention regarded as patentable, which the Examiner appears to misunderstand in his rejections and statements.

Applicant's claim 1 is herein amended to specifically recite a navigation and data-gathering utility for navigating to and gathering content and other data from Web pages associated with the captured URLs. The language of depending claim 6 is also herein amended to agree in language to the parent claim as

- 6 -

amended herein. Claim 7 is applicant's method claim for practicing the network-based management and data summarization of user-selected URLs, in accordance with the limitations of claim 1. Applicant accordingly herein amends the language of claim 7 to specifically recite, in step(e), navigating to the Web page or pages associated with the URL data for the purpose of obtaining content and other data from the Web page and returning the data in summary form to a user.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner has stated that Joachims teaches a server-based application for helping a user to serve the Web, by capturing URLs selected by a user, and a server-side utility for receiving the URLs captured by the client-side utility. The Examiner admits that Joachims does not specifically teach "data summarization" as claimed by applicant, but that Joachims does teach fetching a Web page associated with the captured URL, to which suggestions are made by highlighting certain URLs of said Web page, thereby providing the claimed equivalent of summarizing URL data, as claimed by applicant.

Applicant respectfully point out to the Examiner that, firstly, applicant does not claim summarizing URL data, applicant's claims specifically recite summarizing data from Web pages. Further, Joachims does not fetch Web pages associated with captured URLs, as stated by the Examiner. Joachims simply teaches summarizing a list of URLs as suggestions for the Web browsing user to follow. The WebWatcher application of Joachims accompanies users from Web page to Web page during browsing, suggesting to the browsing user along the way, appropriate hyperlinks which the user may wish to follow, and providing command functions associated with the application. For example, referring to the portion of Joachims pertaining to "projects" link of Figure 1, at the initial page the user manually enters the subject of interest, in this case "intelligent agents", which elicits a response from the WebWatcher application in the form of highlighted suggested hyperlinks deemed relevant to the browsing interests. The "projects"

- 7 -

link referred to by the Examiner cannot be equated to gathering or summarizing data from Web pages, as contended by the Examiner; rather, the link simply is a URL associated with a Web page that all ready exists in the hosting organizations Web server. The WebWatcher application is not gathering or summarizing any content data or any other data from Web sites associated with URLs captured by the client side application. The WebWatcher application simply records, summarizes and suggests lists, or links to lists, of other URLs which may be associated with URLs captured by the client-side application. The web page is actually "fetched", or accessed by the browsing user, not the data gatherer. This is quite different from obtaining content and other information from the Web page and returning the information in summary form to the user, as is taught in applicant's invention, and recited in applicant's claims.

In contrast, applicant's invention teaches a data gathering and summarization application having functionality and capabilities far beyond that provided by the WebWatcher application of Joachims. Applicant's invention provides a parsing engine which parses individual Web sites according to a template created via a scripting module. The template dictates to the data gatherer where to go and what fields at the destination Web site to look for to access desired data. Once the data is located a parsing engine gathers the current data and returns that data to the service for further processing such as data conversion, compression, storage, and so on.

In one example, applicant's specification discloses on pages 26 and 27, an example of an exemplary script logic for navigating to and garnishing data from the well-known Web site. The script example instructs the controller and parser to navigate to and obtain data from the Web site, specifically that data that reflects the users current order status. Such scripts may be written to obtain virtually any type of text information available from any Web site, for example, newspaper

- 8 -

headlines, top performing stocks, comparative airline flight information, and so on, and all of that data may be summarized to user in the form of a Web page according to user preferences. Applicant's invention teaches a summarization page module provided and adapted to organize and serve a Web summary page to the user, including an HTML renderer capable of formatting data into HTML format for Web page display. The renderer is capable of formatting and presenting the summary data to the user into a number of formats specific to alternative devices.

Further to the above, Joachims does not teach specifically that the WebWatcher application as a client-side application for capturing URLs, nor does Joachims disclose that the Letizia application's single user implementation is specifically client-sided. The Examiner relies on Lieberman to teach these deficiencies. However, in view of applicant's above judicial claim amendment and argument presented, the combination still fails to produce applicant's software application comprising a navigation and data-gathering utility for navigating to and gathering content and other data from the Web pages associated with the captured URLs, as is taught and claimed in applicant's invention. The combined art is still only capable of capturing the URLs and presenting a summarization of suggested associated URLs, not a summarization of content and other data from Web sites associated with the captured URLs, as in applicant's invention and claims as amended.

Applicant therefore firmly believes that claim 1 as amended and argued above is clearly and unarguably patentable over the references cited and applied by the Examiner, either singly or in combination. Claims 2-6 are than patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Regarding independent claim 7, the Examiner has stated that the claim reflects the method comprising computer executable instructions used in

- 9 -

performing the system as claimed in claim 1, and relies on the same art combination for reading on the limitations of the claim, rejecting the claim using the same rationale as for claim 1. Applicant has herein amended the language of claim 7 to specifically recite, in step(e), navigating to the Web page or pages associated with the URL data for the purpose of obtaining content and other data from the Web page and returning the data in summary form to a user. In view of the argument presented above by applicant on behalf of claim 1, claim 7 as amended is also now clearly and unarguably patentable over the prior art provided by the Examiner, either singly or in combination. Claims 8-10 are then patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims standing for examination have been shown to be patentable as amended over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jonathan Wu et al.

by



Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Donald R. Boys
Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(831) 726-1457